



## The Oregonian.

PORTLAND, SATURDAY, APRIL 13.

The house on Eleventh street, between Washington and B streets, bought for a city hall, is in a central and accessible locality, and at the price paid for it—\$30,000—is a bargain for the city.

The school children of this district will be given a half-holiday on the 30th of April. This will be a pleasant way of impressing upon them the historical fact that the holiday is intended to commemorate.

The 22d of April will be "opening day" for Oregon. It will also be the day on which constitutional prohibition is to be voted upon in Massachusetts. Lively times are expected in both places on the day named.

An unusually elastic foot-report from Chicago. We jumped from a bridge over the Kentucky river 225 feet high into twelve feet of water, and bobbed up serenely in a moment unharmed, and fancying himself a hero.

The Boston Standard is informed by letter from Mr. Horrman, that the commissioners to examine applicants for places in the civil service in Oregon will be at Portland May 8, and at Roseburg May 9. He also says there have been nothing done about appointments to the Roseburg land office and post-office. "The president is moving slowly," and "present incumbents as a rule will be allowed to serve their time."

A Yenkee paper is so regardless as to assert that, although there are many women who can "swallow a horse's mouth and spit the bones of his back, there are very few who can drive." Of course a large proportion of these unusually accomplished women claim Yamhill county as their home. The paper quoted with the fact that a young lady of McMinnville cannot only drive, but that she drives faster than any man, and is a good example to the rest of us. The fact is, however, that the rider is a Yamhill country girl if not indeed, but the inference is in favor of the latter.

Yellow fever is prevalent to an alarming extent in Rio de Janeiro. It will take the utmost vigilance on the part of the health officers of the Atlantic seaboard to keep the deadly disease from entering the ports of the United States, and the closest attention to sanitary regulations to stamp out the germs that survive in the districts that were visited by the scourge last year. Even with the greatest care, it is scarcely possible that Brazil and other sections of the South, will escape wholly, although vigilant and intelligent endeavor is being made to control the conditions that engender and foster the disease.

A Forest Grove correspondent of the Hillsboro Independent says that the number of shipwrecks in the harbor of the Columbia at this place, is a fine chance for looting, killing, and robbing slaves in the neutral zone that form the boundaries line between Washington and Willamette counties. The only trouble is in finding lands accessible for lumbering that are "timber lands," according to the literal interpretation of the act by the government land commissioners—that is, lands that are "valuable chiefly for timber." But, in the land is so difficult to clear, and to bring into cultivation, that in most cases he is called "valuable chiefly for timber," though, in reality, it produces grain, fruits, and vegetables in abundance when properly cultivated. Such land, however, will soon be cleared merely for agriculture. But if it can be taken as timber land, and the timber can be removed, then it may pay to bring it into cultivation.

The Oregonian urges the dissemination of information concerning that region by proper advertising on the cars between Huntington and Arlington. It urges the well-known fact that the country as viewed from the car windows presents an uninviting aspect, and adds: "Such advertising would be the means of bringing into the country farmers, mechanics and capitalists, all of which we, as a community, must have in order to enjoy that prosperity which the country merits. We have a good country, but there must be some means of imparting that information to those who travel."

This idea is the greatest one that I ever heard will prove far more profitable than the usual plan adopted in different sections of the state, of growing at Portland for inducing immigrants to come thither, who might, if our board of trade and immigration agents were less active, go elsewhere. Anytime that is worth having is worth working for. If population is required, take measures to secure it, and leave grumbling and complaints to those who are not energetic or sagacious enough to advertise.

may easily obtain, all the money necessary for them. The taxes on liquor and tobacco if increased, should be well distributed, so as to do all these things as fast as we can, and to do them well. These taxes will nearly one hundred and fifty millions a year. They ought not to be cut off or reduced, but ought to be continued, and the money, besides paying all pensions, would suffice for carrying out this great policy of creating a navy, putting our ports in a state of defense, and securing the great public works that regard that for the growth and development of the country requires. The duties levied on foreign goods will be ample for all the other expenditures of the government.

The republican party, in its platform of last year, indicated that it would surrender the entire internal revenue system—other words, would repeat all the taxes on liquors and tobacco, and then add to the system of protective duties. But it used to do neither. It may maintain the protective system, and yet collect the taxes from liquors and tobacco and devote them to the great national objects heretofore indicated. And why should it not? No other articles can be taxed so properly; and if the taxes are removed beer will not be sold for less than 5 cents a glass, nor will a cigar be a farthing cheaper to any customer.

There would be an argument for repeal of the taxes on liquors and tobacco, if repeat of these taxes were necessary for maintenance of the protection to the interests of American labor; but if we devote to the creation of a navy and the construction of public works sum sums into the interests of the treasury, then there will not be any advantage enjoyed by the treasury for many years to come. Besides there will be employment for hand and mechanical workers in all the ships of industry and trade.

**A TALE OF SHIPWRECK.**  
The great world of people, who grieve over their shrouded paper to dry homes, and around cheerful breakfast tables, read with a shudder of horror and awe-stricken interest that is awakened by no other event, the announcement of an ocean disaster that plunges a helpless mass of human beings into a common sepulcher. And when to this tale of disaster is added a veritable mystery, of which an abandoned vessel, drifting without a helmsman in mid-ocean, with every appearance of life swept from her decks, and seemingly ready at any moment to make her final plunge into the depths, the interest in her fate and that of those known to have been on board of her when she sailed a few days before, becomes pain fully absorbing.

The story should end, as old as tradition, in navigation, and its accompaniment of the immigrant-carrying ship that has for years kept huge vessels from flying between the American and European ports. Few of its features are new, and its incidents as they come in, perhaps days after the shipwreck, have the same general outline. Terror-stricken passengers, pressing eagerly forward to the better safety, in defiance of the wearisome and hopeless children overboard in the fraying, laboring vessel, cry for help which comes not, stilled at length by the surging and remorseless waves, and laid the placid bosom of the treacherous sea, upon which is written no tale of the disaster.

These are the customary accompaniments of shipwreck. A desire to know the word-holding sympathy in abeyance and force the perusal of the story, though it may furnish a few details, does not differ in name, date and locality.

The case of the Donibane, an immigrant packet, having on board 300 men and 800 souls, is now claiming the earnest sympathy and attention of the public on both sides of the Atlantic. A wanderer in mid-ocean, tempestuous, with nothing in her appearance to indicate the nature of the disaster that had befallen her, she was sighted by a passing steamer, and there being no appearance of human life on board was left to her fate. The sea may yet send up some tale of the misfortune that befell her, but it is hardly to be reckoned among possibilities, certainly it is not among things probable that any great proportion of the crew, who are the "valuable chiefly for timber," may be lost, stilled at length by the surging and remorseless waves, and laid the placid bosom of the treacherous sea, upon which is written no tale of the disaster.

It is the desire of the public that must move him of the spirit of God. The outside world, never having felt or experienced this calamity, of it, and much less entitled to judge of it.

Judge Williams says there are limits to the human understanding. True, and that is just what makes Judge Williams, "I don't know," which makes Judge Williams "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polytheism in Greece yesterday, but whether the kernel of this Christianity is "In humanity. Its self-sacrifice, its

faith in God and brotherhood of man, its supernaturalism, its mysticologie and dogma, and theological separation from medieval superstition and theological dogma, is simply the most recent, but not necessarily the ultimate or final stride of moral and religious evolution. The question in controversy is not whether Christianity and monotheism to-day are not better in every way than polythe









# JUDGE LYNECE:

A Romance of the California Vineyards.

WRITTEN JOINTLY BY

BRANDER MATTHEWS and GEORGE H. JESSOP.

Well Known Contributors to the Leading American and English Magazines and Authors of Popular Works of Fiction.

(Copyright 1889 by the Authors.)

## CHAPTER IX

The fever of excitement that had worked like madmen in San Pedro during the earlier evenings had died out. The fever of the brains of the village to whom every new thing was a good thing had cleared; I then saw how false it is that men who stand alone have all the energy in the world; but I forward while my obstinate friend was and had really retired to bed prepared to tell the town that he had slipped on a cramp since leaving the town and his features were pale on the morrow when he had laid it over night and now they exhaled by droplets of foam. He was pale, too, but not so pale as the others. The two leaders, and Dohle, were still afoot. They were the men to whom in Pablo's school no common sense-man who was believed they were acting for the best good of society, and who were resolved to stamp out lawlessness, wherever they could reach it. The whirlwind of the evening had passed over their heads and left them cool and resolute. The quiet on came and found them cool and resolute still. A man in whom I am confident of far more direct and resolute than Judge Lynch, yet he appeared to fawn on the man on Scott. To those minds the sequel was never in doubt. Scott must yield him a life—a life for more useful and meritorious than the life he had taken—that San Pedro's dearly bought reputation for law and order might not perish.

When Hiram Jeffries entered the Spread Eagle Inn he was received by the landlord, who had been waiting for him at least an hour or two before there was little drinking, there was no dispute or discussion among the various groups; there was no oratorical effort to inflame the passion of the mob. On all sides there was a settled reserve, grimly evident on the dark faces of those present—a resolve that waited in silence and bled its time.

Judge Byrne was probably the only man of the thirty or more present who was out of sympathy with the general purpose. He had felt relieved when the crowd began to scatter, and the more turbulent spirits one by one sought their homes, but he soon realized that those who were left represented a far more dangerous element—the element of unfeared almost consciousness—resoluteness.

The Red Rock Rancher, who was a politician from his boyhood, but was not a statesman, was one of such success as he had gained in the facile politics of his district had been achieved, not by directing minds of instigating motives, but by careful adherence to prejudices, and by steadily swimming with the tide.

Byrne with a majority at his back was a potent force as one of a minority he was a trimmings, but when he was a majority he was an acknowledged leader, a moment longer than he could help it. On this occasion convinced as he was of Jack's innocence, and entertaining a real affection for the young man he ventured to speak up in defense of him in a man of his position was little short of heroic. But a few brief words from the leaders convinced him that his efforts were useless, and he drew back into a corner and watched with a painful consciousness that for once in his life he had undertaken to champion a losing cause.

Kate had just entered the room with the announcement that the mail had arrived and that the post office had closed. It was the hour to pursue the inquiries on horseback to San Antonio if necessary, but the arrival of the mail-birds, and the news he brought, showed the way to prompt action.

He took the mail as good as dead men are to ground, but he was temperate as a rule, but the glass of whisky he poured out for him at that moment was deadly.

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," he said, "and you are to the left."

"I am to the right," she said, "and you are to the left."



